

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in this Application.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 10-12, and 14 are currently amended.

Many of the rejections based on *Simonoff* and/or *Estrada* are rendered moot in light of the current amendments to the claims; therefore, Applicants do not currently address each of the Examiner's counterarguments regarding points a-l enumerated in the July 22, 2005 Office Action (p. 3). Regarding the rejections of claims 1-17, Applicants do not agree with Examiner's interpretation and application of the prior art to reject the claims; however, Applicant's currently amend several claims to more clearly define the subject matter of the present invention. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of the claims in light of the amendments and the following:

**35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) rejections based on *Simonoff***

Claims 1-5, 7, 10-17 stand rejected as anticipated by *Simonoff* (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,460). Claims 1, 7 10-12, and 14 are currently amended and recite limitations not found in *Simonoff*. Claims 4-5 and 10-17 depend from amended claims that recite limitations not disclosed or suggested by *Simonoff*.

*Simonoff's* disclosed system has fundamental differences from the present invention because *Simonoff's* system relies on centralized creation of white boards within a single organization using a centralized white board server. *See Simonoff*, Fig. 3. The Specification of the present application points out the need for a system that decentralizes creation of a web site for presentation...to reduce the time required for getting the presentation material formatted." *See Specification*, p. 5, col. 7-12 (citations to original pagination). The Specification of the present Application states, "A distributed application service provider allows decentralized and dynamic creation of virtual events for presentation." (emphasis added) Col. 5, lines 18-20. Claim 1, as amended, recites that an organization has "decentralized control over the virtual event." (emphasis added). *Simonoff* does not teach or suggest this limitation. There are other recitations in amended claim 1 not disclosed in the references. For example, amended claim 1 recites, "an anonymous browser module that grants to an unregistered user authority to view a

predetermined portion of the virtual event." Nowhere does *Simonoff* teach or suggest any such anonymous browser module. In addition, amended claim 1 recites, "the ASP administration module providing templates used by plural contributors to upload content for virtual events, and the ASP administration module granting authority to the plural organizations to create, access, and present virtual events." Likewise, *Simonoff* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Therefore, the disclosure of *Simonoff* has fundamental differences with the claimed subject matter and *Simonoff* does not disclose every element of claim 1 as amended. Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and therefore recite the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, claims 1-5 are allowable over *Simonoff* and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-5.

Similar to claim 1, claim 7 is currently amended and recites limitations not disclosed by *Simonoff*. Claim 7 recites, "providing unregistered attendees authority to view predetermined portions of the virtual events." *Simonoff* does not disclose or suggest this feature. Further, claim 7 recites that the "organization administrator is granted authority to grant access by an administrator." These limitations suggest decentralized control, and as stated with regard to claim 1, *Simonoff* does not teach decentralized control. Still further, claim 7 recites, "the associated event champion authorized to approve the uploaded content." Again, this element of decentralized control permitting an event champion to approve uploaded content is not taught or suggested by *Simonoff's* disclosures related to centralized control. Therefore, *Simonoff* does not teach or suggest every limitation of amended claim 7 and claim 7 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 10-17 depend from claim 7 and therefore recite the limitations of claim 7. Therefore, claim 7 and 10-13 are allowable over *Simonoff* and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 7 and 10-17.

Similar to claims 1 and 7, claim 14 is amended and recites limitations not disclosed by *Simonoff* relating to decentralized control as compared to *Simonoff's* centralized control. For example, amended claim 1 recites, "wherein the organization administrator grants authority to a plurality of organizations to access the network, wherein each organization controls associated virtual events based on templates from the network administrator." These elements are not taught or suggested by *Simonoff's* disclosures related to centralized control. Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and recite the limitations of claim 14. Therefore, claims 14 and 15-17 are

allowable over *Simonoff* and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claims 14 and 15-17.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections based on *Simonoff* and *Estrada***

Claims 6, 8, and 9 are rejected as obvious over *Simonoff* in view of *Estrada* (U.S. Patent No. 6,732,148). Claim 6 depends from amended claim 1, which recites limitations not taught or suggested by any combination of *Simonoff* and *Estrada*, as discussed above regarding claim 1. Similarly, claims 8 and 9 depend from amended claim 7, which recites limitations not taught or suggested by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, claims 6, 8, and 9 are allowable for the cited references. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the obviousness rejections based on *Simonoff* and *Estrada*.


**Conclusion**

Claims 1, 6, 7-8, 10-12, and 14 are currently amended and recite limitations not found in any combination of the cited references. Claims 2-6, 8-13, and 15-17 depend from amended claims which recite subject matter that is not anticipated or obvious over any combination of the cited references. Therefore, claims 1-17 are allowable over the cited references and Applicants respectfully request withdrawals of any remaining rejection.

With the addition of no new claims, no additional filing fees are due. However, Applicants respectfully request a One (1) Month Extension of Time to File this Response. Enclosed with this report is Form PTO/SB/22 with Extension Fees in the amount of \$60.00 as reflected on the PTO/SB/17 Fee Transmittal. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 23-2426 of WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this paper or the present application in general, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (214) 745-5798.

Respectfully submitted,  
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruben C. DeLeon  
Reg. No. 37,812

P. O. Box 50784  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Fax: 214.745.5390

Dallas\_1\4246132\2  
38715-P020US 9/27/2005